

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-5 are presently pending, with claim 1 being independent.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 USC § 112 ¶ 1 as containing subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such as way as to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention.

Claim 1 features the *"...light sources are provided so as to have the same parasitic capacitance caused by intervals between said light sources and said light reflection member."*

The Office Action indicates that it is unclear how parasitic capacitance works in the absence of unexpected test results or any theoretical formula to support this limitation.

Applicant respectfully asserts that parasitic capacitance is well-known in a multiplicity of electronic arts, including consumer electronic devices in backlit LCD devices. In one embodiment described in the application, it is noted that an excessive lamp current can be avoided by unifying the parasitic capacitance of the lamp, whereby the life time of the lamp can be extended and can contribute to a longer life time of products in its turn. (Kindly refer to page 2, lines 22-26 for support for the above assertion.) Moreover, in the filed application at page 3 line 32 through page 4, line 2 it is noted *"...the lamp of the first or the third is arranged such that the parasitic capacitance (floating capacitance) of the lamps caused by the gap of the lamp and the reflector 19 become equal each other. The inventor has recognized that at least one lamp at the central is kept away from the side of the panel than other lamps and is arranged closer to the reflector 19b, whereby the parasitic capacitances can be equalized effectively."*

It is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize from the referenced portions of the filed application, as well as from a review of the entire application, which describe the equalization of parasitic capacitance, how to effect such equalization as well as why the need to do so exists.

The above discussion notwithstanding, Applicant notes the disclosure of U.S. Patent 5,999,155 to *Satou*, which is included in an information disclosure statement (IDS) filed concurrently herewith. The reference to *Satou* is drawn to a liquid crystal display (LCD) element and a display device that uses the LCD element. A capacitance ratio RA_{C1} is set such that a prescribed relationship is established, and this relationship is inversely dependent on the parasitic capacitance (C_x) between the pixel electrode and the source electrode. (Kindly see column 1, lines 47-67 as well as the Abstract of *Satou*). It is respectfully submitted that parasitic capacitance is well within the purview of the artisan of ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand the concept of parasitic capacitance and that based on Applicant's disclosure would be able to make and use Applicant's invention.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Miller, et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,390,638). For at least the reasons set forth below, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable over the applied art.

Independent claim 1 features that “...*light sources are provided so as to have the same parasitic capacitance caused by intervals between said light sources and said light reflection member.*”

It is respectfully submitted that the reference to *Miller, et al.* lacks at least the disclosure that the light sources have the same parasitic capacitance. *Miller, et al.* disclose a device for illuminating a flat panel using PTFE as a reflecting medium. However, the reference lacks at least the cited features of claim 1.

Accordingly, and for at least these reasons, independent claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom are patentable over the applied art. Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of all rejections and objections of record, the allowance of all pending claims, and the holding of this application in condition for allowance. If any points remain of issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Except as otherwise stated in the above noted Remarks, Applicant notes that each of the amendments have been made to place the claims in better form for U.S. practice, not to distinguish the claims from prior art references, otherwise narrow the scope of previously pending claims or comply with other statutory requirements.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 50-0238 for any required fees including, but not limited to, any fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17.

In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact William S. Francos, Esq. (Reg. No. 38,456) at (610) 375-3513 to discuss these matters.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of:
Philips Electronics North America Corp.



By: William S. Francos (Reg. No. 38,456)

August 21, 2003
Volentine Francos, PLLC
Treeview Corporate Center
Two Meridian Blvd.
Wyomissing, PA 19610
(610) 375-3513